

REMARKS

This amendment, submitted in reply to the Office action dated March 23, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended to correct an informality. A non-narrowing amendment is set forth above.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner has objected to an informality in claim 1. A proposed correction is set forth above.

Turning to the merits of the Office Action, claims 1-7 remain pending in the application. Claims 3-5 have been withdrawn from further consideration at this time pursuant to the Response to Restriction Requirement filed on November 19, 2004. Claims 2 and 7 have been deemed allowable over the art of record but have been objected to for depending on a rejected base claim. Claims 1 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Flanders (U.S.P. 6,362,919) in view of Dalgoutte (U.S.P. 4,398,796). Applicants respectfully submit the following arguments in traversal of the prior art rejections.

Because claim 1 has been deemed generic, applicants would request rejoinder of non-elected claims 3-5 in the present application.

Applicants submit the distance between the light-emission end of the optical fiber and the light-emission window in the present invention is longer than that of Dalgoutte et al. Since in the present invention, the light-emission window is provided at a predetermined distance from the light-emission end, the density of light at the light-emission window is lower than the density of

light at the light-emission end. In the present invention, since the density of light is reduced, contamination due to the laser beam is prevented.

In contrast, in Dalgoutte et al., the thickness of the glass in the light-emission window is thin (see column 1, lines 54 and 55 of Dalgoutte et al.). The glass is thinner than the diameter of fiber core, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 of Dalgoutte et al. Further no space is provided between the glass and the light-emission end, as illustrated in Figure 3 of Dalgoutte et al. Therefore, in Dalgoutte et al., the distance between the glass and the light-emission end is short, and the density of light is not reduced. Hence, contamination due to the laser beam is not prevented in Dalgoutte et al. In Dalgoutte et al., the glass is provided only to prevent the fiber end from sticking out and to protect the fiber end (see column 2, lines 5 and 6). Claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

Claim 7 is patentable based on its dependency.

The present invention has been made to solve the problem of contamination, caused by the high resolution exposure light and the high output beam. In view of the above remarks, since Flanders is not directed to obtainment of the high-resolution exposure light source and high-output beam, those skilled in the art would not have conceived of the present invention based on the invention of Flanders.

Applicants add claims 8-10 to describe the feature of the invention more particularly.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

U.S. Serial No. 10/670,473
Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Atty Docket No. Q77631

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan Perry Pan
Registration No. 41,239

Date: July 25, 2005